

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/016,964	12/14/2001	Heidi Riedel	Beiersdorf 755-KGB 7321		
	7590 05/02/200 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.	EXAMINER			
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			KANTAMNENI, SHOBHA		
RESTON, VA	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1617	1	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
	• •		05/02/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/016,964	RIEDEL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Shobha Kantamneni	1617	

	Shobha Kantamneni	1617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AI	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aftice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply missing the control of	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origon than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		•	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all proposed or amended claim(s) 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: NONE. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 18-43. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	II be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See page 2.</u> 		n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	Inavelle	~
		Padma <mark>nabhan</mark> V Patent Examini	ER

Continuation of 11:

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellon et al., and rejection of Claims 18-22, 28-33, 35, 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beutler et al. (US 4,808,388, PT0-1449) have been fully considered, but not found persuasive as discussed in the final office action. The rejections are MAINTAINED

Rejection of Claim 42:

Applicant argues that "Applicants respectfully submit that PENSKA does not contain the slightest indication that the oil-in-water emulsions of Examples 6 and 7 of PENSKA are self-foaming and/or foam-like". This argument has been fully considered, but not found persuasive because Penske discloses compositions comprising the same ingredients as instantly claimed i.e a gaseous ingredient, 3 % by weight of stearic acid, 0.5 % by weight of cetyl alcohol, 0.5 % by weight of peg-100 stearate, and thus would inherently possess the properties such as self-foaming as instantly claimed.

Applicant argues that "the composition of Example 1 of MARILYN does not contain an emulsifier B as recited in claim 42." This argument has been considered, but not found persausive because Marilyn discloses self foaming shave cream compositions comprising 6.58 % by weight of palmitic acid, 0.97 % by weight of stearyl alcohol, 0.15 % by weight of PEG-150 stearic acid diester, and about 3.24 % of a propellant. It is also disclosed that the PEG distearate, a fatty acid diester of the polyethylene glycol should have a molecular weight of at least about 1000, preferably at least about 6000, and thus meets the instant limitation of 5 to 100 ethylene glycol units.